

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/602,671	06/25/2003	Yukinori Noguchi	2091-0286P	1973	
2292 BIRCH STEW	7590 09/25/200° ART KOLASCH & BI		EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747			BAUM, RONALD		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2136		
		,	-		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

r	٦	
	4	

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>
10/602,671	NOGUCHI, YUKINORI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ronald Baum	2136	

	Ronald Baum	2136					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 14 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		I E below);					
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will will will will will will will wi	ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:		,					
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			•				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome all rejections under appear	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As per applicant's argument concerning the lack of teaching by Kuzma of security for the properties of the image data/content, the examiner has fully considered in this response to amendment; the arguments, and finds them not to be persuasive.

At the very least, if security for the email and associated attachment is such that the security is applied to both, as detailed in the arguments made in the previous office action, the the security processing is indeed applied to the properties, prior to storage in any associated email servers invovled in the email forwarding thru the network(s)/Internet. Further, the claim language does not explicitly claim distinct security processing methods or distinct items of property information, such that any 'bulk' security processing done to the email/attachment (i.e., cryptographic encryption, hashing, etc.,), done prior to storage/caching thru the network nodes clearly encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner. Also, email/attachment management via associated mail servers would clearly correspond to management of the associated image data content of said attachments.

The examiner declines to reopen prosecution. Thus, any such claims submitted formally after final rejection would not be entered..

NASSER MOAZZAMI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

9120107